Application No. 10/540,238 August 29, 2006 Reply to the Office Action dated May 5, 2006 Page 6 of 7

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 7-12 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicants amend the Title of the Invention and claims 11 and 12.

The Title of the Invention was objected to for not being descriptive. Applicants have amended the Title of the Invention to be more descriptive. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the Title of the Invention.

Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 11 and 12 have been amended to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 7-12 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousnesstype double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 8-14 of Mikado et al. (U.S. 2006/0081048) in view of U.S. copending Application No. 10/540,240.

Claims 7-12 were also rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 9-14 of U.S. copending Application No. 10/540,240 in view of Mikado et al. (U.S. 2006/0081048).

In the accompanying Terminal Disclaimer, Applicants have disclaimed the terminal portion of the statutory term of any patent granted on the instant application, which would extend beyond the expiration date of the full statutory term defined in 35 U.S.C. 154 to 156 and 173, as shortened by any terminal disclaimer filed prior to the grant of commonly owned U.S. Published Application No. 2006/0081048 and commonly owned U.S. Application No. 10/540,240.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the provisional rejections of claims 7-12 under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 8-14 of commonly owned U.S. Published Application No. 2006/0081048 and claims 9-14 of commonly owned U.S. Application No. 10/540.240.

Application No. 10/540,238 August 29, 2006 Reply to the Office Action dated May 5, 2006 Page 7 of 7

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is allowable. Claims 8-12 depend upon claim 7, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that claim 7 is allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition the Commissioner for a ONE-month extension of time, extending to September 5, 2006, the period for response to the Office Action dated May 5, 2006.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 29, 2006

KEATING & BENNETT, LLP 8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850 Tyson's Corner, VA 22102 Telephone: (703) 637-1480

Facsimile: (703) 637-1499

/Stephen R. Funk #57,751/ Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Joseph R. Keating Registration No. 37,368

Stephen R. Funk Registration No. 57,751